

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended Claims 1-3, 7-8, 10 and 14. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Examiner Objections – Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of the specification. In response, the Applicant has amended claim 14 to correspond to elements disclosed in Figures 1 and 2. The Examiner's consideration of the amendments to claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Examiner Objections - Claims

The Examiner objected to 3, 8, and 14 because of informalities. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims. The Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner in order to correct the informalities. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner objected to claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant respectfully submits that the method is tied to a mobile communications network and a subscriber's mobile terminal. Transformation is made of a request for an accounting certificate into an accounting certificate. The Applicant has further amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner and respectfully submits that the claims are now directed to statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the

invention. Claim 1 has been amended to correct the rejection in paragraph 16. Regarding claim 2 in paragraph 17, the Applicant respectfully submits that "a home network" is recited in the preamble to claim 1. Claim 3 has been amended. Claim 7 has been amended to correct the vague phrase. Claim 8 has been amended. Claim 10 has been amended.

Claim 14 is rejected as failing to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure to the claimed function. The Applicant submits that the amendments to claim 14 clearly link the functions, mostly to the PKI portal. Support for the amendments is found in Figure 1 and the second paragraph of the Description of Figure 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nevoux, et al. (US 5,412,726) in view of Puhl, et al. (US 6,223,291). The Applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly claim the invention to which the Applicant is entitled. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The present invention discloses providing an accounting certificate to a user roaming in a visited network so that the user can access services provided by a service provider outside the visited network. The service provider has a connection/relationship with the visited network so that a certificate received from the user can be redeemed by the service provider from the visited network. The operator (the visited network) does not have a relationship with the user's home network, e.g., the home network is in one country and the service provider is in another country. In this case, the user may be able to obtain a certificate from the user's home network, but the certificate might not be accepted by the service provider. Though not discussed at length in the Specification, the service position disclosed in the present invention is essentially an offline service, where a certificate is provided and is good until used. That is, the certificate may be used at some later time, e.g., several days, after it is obtained.

The present invention allows a visited network to generate and issue certificates to roaming users, but the visited network is required to authorize issuance using a standard online charging system (OCS). The service provider does not need to have a

billing relationship with the home network, but the home network can still control the issuance of certificates without the demands imposed by having to manage cross-certificates, for instance.

The Nevoux reference describes the issuance and use of online subscriber authentication, and others but not accounting certificates. Nevoux discloses that authentication is provided to the subscribers by the subscribers' home networks. However, Nevoux does not disclose how authorization/authentication could be provided to a roaming subscriber. In the Nevoux reference the user would not have access to services where the service provider does not accept certificates issued by the home network.

In discussion of the first limitation of claim 1, the Examiner indicates that the Applicant's certificate issuing node is the equivalent of Nevoux's SAA. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is the CA and the SAA. SAA is an access system and CA is an authorization center and neither entity in Nevoux issues an accounting certificate. For example, from C4, L42-L43, "An authorization center CA connected to the system SAA supervises and checks, ... the communications between the access system and the autonomous sets." Also in C12, L12-L16, "The access system SAA is located at the level of the VLR ... and the authority CA is located at the level of the HLR...". The Applicant respectfully submits that the Nevoux reference fails to disclose the issuance of an accounting certificate and the issuance of an accounting certificate to a subscriber in a visited network.

The Puhl reference is cited as disclosing the last element in claim 1, that of sending the accounting certificate from the subscriber terminal to a provider of a product or service to be paid for. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Puhl reference refers to certificates throughout the patent, this is true. However, Puhl discloses a Attribute Authority that is similar to an account manager (C12, L15-L20). A validation server is included in Puhl that validates certificates for domain members and members that cross-certify are expected to provide servers that obtain and validate certificate chains. (C12, L21-L25). The Attribute Authority provides for License Certificates, Public Key Certificates Product Certificates, but no accounting certificate. The closest Puhl comes to an accounting certificate is that of the AA instructing a CA to bill a customer for a

predetermined fee and the CA instructs the billing computer to add it to the customer's bill (C13, L61 to C14, L1). The Applicant respectfully submits that Puhl does not disclose sending an accounting certificate to a provider to pay for a product or service.

The Applicant's invention also avoids the problems with cross-certification, disclosed in Puhl, by providing an online Network Application Function node that facilitates communication with a charging function to approve a user's account and issue an accounting certificate to effect a purchasing step in the visited network.

The Applicant respectfully submits that, whether considered individually or in combination, the Nevoux and Puhl references fail to disclose the issuance of accounting certificates, issuing of an accounting certificate to a subscriber in a visited network and sending the accounting certificate from the subscriber terminal to the provider of the product or service. The Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of amended independent claims 1 and 14.

Claims 2-13 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2-13 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sidney L. Weatherford/

By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: October 11, 2010

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com
(972) 583-8656